

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicants originally submitted Claims 1-21 in the application. In the present response, the Applicants have amended Claims 1, 8, and 15. Support for the amendment can be found, for example, in paragraphs 59-60 and Figure 5 of the original specification. No other claims have been canceled or added. Accordingly, Claims 1-21 are currently pending in the application.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,933,627 to Parady in view of an article by Li, et al., entitled "The Effects of STEF in a Finely Parallel Multithreaded Processors," ©1995 IEEE. During the telephonic interview of August 9, 2007, the Examiner indicated that amended independent Claims 1 and 8 overcome the combination of the cited references. As such, the cited combination of Parady and Li does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness of amended independent Claims 1 and 8 and Claims that depend thereon. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the §103(a) rejection of Claims 1-14 and allow issuance thereof.

II. Rejection of Claims 15-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 15-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Parady in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,509,006 by Wilford, *et al.* in further view of Li. As noted above, the cited combination of Parady and Li does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness of amended independent Claims 1 and 8. Analogously, the cited combination of Parady and Li does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness of amended independent Claim 15. Wilford has not

been cited to cure the noted deficiencies of the cited combination of Parady and Li but to teach a tree engine that parses data within PDUs. (*See* Examiner's Action electronically delivered May 21, 2007, page 9.) As such, the cited combination of Parady, Wilford, and Li does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness of amended independent Claim 15 and Claims that depend thereon. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the §103(a) rejection of Claims 15-21 and allow issuance thereof.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, the Applicants now see all of the Claims currently pending in this application to be in condition for allowance and therefore earnestly solicit a Notice of Allowance for Claims 1-21.

The Applicants request the Examiner to telephone the undersigned attorney of record at (972) 480-8800 if such would further or expedite the prosecution of the present application. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, credits or overpayments to Deposit Account 08-2395.

Respectfully submitted,

HITT GAINES, PC



J. Joel Justiss
Registration No. 48,981

Dated: August 20, 2007

P.O. Box 832570
Richardson, Texas 75083
(972) 480-8800